

WILLIAM G. MONTGOMERY
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY
By: Ann Thompson Uglietta (013696)
J. Scott Dutcher (026174)
Deputy County Attorneys
CIVIL SERVICES DIVISION
222 North Central Avenue, Suite 1100
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Telephone No. (602) 506-8541
Facsimile No. (602) 506-8567
uglietta@mcao.maricopa.gov
dutcherj@mcao.maricopa.gov

Attorneys for Defendant Sheriff Arpaio

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL WORKERS LOCAL 99, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

V.

JAN BREWER, in her official capacity as Governor of the State of Arizona, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No: 2:11-cv-921-PHX-GMS

**DEFENDANT SHERIFF ARPAIO'S
REPLY IN SUPPORT DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO DISMISS
INTERVENORS' COMPLAINT**

Defendant Sheriff Arpaio respectfully submits this Reply in Support of his Motion to Dismiss Intervenors' Complaint. Sheriff Arpaio also joins in the State Defendants' anticipated Reply to be filed in the next few days.

The Declaration of Don Carr (Doc 86-1), in part, clearly demonstrates the redressability and ripeness defects in Intervenors' Complaint. In paragraph 18 of his Declaration, Mr. Carr reveals that the only picketing activity that SEIU Arizona is currently considering is to picket "a private employer, Pima Council on Aging for All, Inc., to inform the public about a labor dispute." (Doc 86-1 at 6.) This Court may take judicial notice of the fact that this entity, as its name suggests, is located in Pima County (specifically Tucson), far outside of Sheriff Arpaio's jurisdiction.

1 SEIU Arizona does not dispute that Sheriff Arpaio's MCSO is unlikely to be the
 2 responding police agency to any of SEIU Arizona's activities. He has no authority
 3 outside of Maricopa County. And within the City of Phoenix, where SEIU Arizona
 4 implies that most of the allegedly chilled activity will occur, the City of Phoenix Police
 5 Department would most likely be the responding police agency. No other police agency
 6 in the state (except possibly DPS via the State Defendants) is a party to this case.
 7 Ultimately, because SEIU Arizona has failed to join in all police agencies in the State,
 8 the injunction it seeks will not redress its alleged injuries. SEIU Arizona too quickly
 9 glosses over this reality by attempting to have the Court focus instead on SEIU
 10 Arizona's general and subjective fears of prosecution and chilled speech. But the
 11 inescapable reality is that the tacitly conceded unlikely role by Sheriff Arpaio in any
 12 arrest or prosecution is, in large part, also why these subjective fears are not "well-
 13 founded" and why SEIU Arizona's allegations of a subjective 'chill' are similarly
 14 inadequate to show an injury in fact. *See Laird v. Tatum*, 408 U.S. 1, 13-14 (1972)
 15 ("Allegations of a subjective 'chill' are not an adequate substitute for a claim of specific
 16 present objective harm or a threat of specific future harm."); *Cal. Pro-Life Council, Inc.*
 17 *v. Getman*, 328 F.3d 1088, 1095 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting *Virginia v. Am. Booksellers*
 18 *Ass'n*, 484 U.S. 383, 393 (1988)) ("The potential plaintiff must have 'an actual and well-
 19 founded fear that the law will be enforced against [him or her]' [and] such a fear of
 20 prosecution will only inure if the plaintiff's intended speech arguably falls within the
 21 statute's reach.").

22 SEIU Arizona's reliance on *Los Angeles County Bar Ass'n v. Eu*, 979 F.2d 697,
 23 701 (9th Cir. 1992) in support of its standing argument is misplaced. That court found
 24 standing because if it were "to rule in [plaintiff's] favor, it [was] likely that the alleged
 25 injury would be to some extent ameliorated." *Id.* In that case, the County Bar
 26 Association brought a constitutional challenge on a California statute prescribing the
 27 number of judges on the superior court for Los Angeles County, alleging a violation of
 28 due process and equal protection. *Id.* Any change in the number of judges was

1 guaranteed to have a direct impact. *Id.* But here, SEIU Arizona cannot demonstrate that
2 an injunction against Sheriff Arpaio is likely to have any impact. Except in the few
3 Maricopa County islands, where it is extremely unlikely for SEIU Arizona to engage in
4 any picketing activity, Sheriff Arpaio shares law enforcement responsibilities with
5 various city police departments. Therefore, even if Sheriff Arpaio were enjoined to take
6 any action, SEIU Arizona would still have the same general and subjective fears of
7 prosecution and chilled speech by other law enforcement agencies. Further, granting
8 SEIU Arizona's requested injunction against Sheriff Arpaio and not against any of the
9 other county and city law enforcement agencies in the State would create an impractical
10 and silly checkerboard result of different law enforcement agencies in Maricopa County
11 with different powers under the same statute.

12 SEIU Arizona does not have standing. It cannot demonstrate an injury in fact. It
13 failed to show that its claims are redressable against Sheriff Arpaio, and its claims are
14 not presently ripe for review. Accordingly, the Complaint in Intervention for Injunctive
15 and Declaratory Relief (Doc. 52) should be dismissed.

16 || RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 15th day of September 2011.

**WILLIAM G. MONTGOMERY
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY**

BY: /s/ J. Scott Dutcher
ANN THOMPSON UGLIETTA
J. SCOTT DUTCHER
Attorneys for Defendant Sheriff Arpaio

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following this 15th day of September 2011 to:

Andrew J. Kahn
Elizabeth A. Lawrence
DAVIS COWELL & BOWE LLP
2401 North Central Avenue, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Attorneys for Plaintiffs UFCW Local 99,
McLaughlin and Colbath

Gerald Barrett
WARD, KEENAN & BARRETT, P.C.
3838 North Central Avenue, Suite 1720
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
Attorneys for Plaintiffs UA Local 469
and McNally

Michael K. Goodwin
James Evan Barton
ARIZONA OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
1275 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2997
Attorneys for State Defendants

Jennifer Sung
Jonathan Weissglass
Michael Rubin
P. Casey Pitts
ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
177 Post Street, Ste. 300
San Francisco, California 94108
Attorneys for Intervenor Plaintiff
Local 5 Service Employees International Union

Stanley Lubin
LUBIN & ENOCH PC
349 North 4th Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Attorneys for Intervenor Plaintiff
Local 5 Service Employees International Union

Alice Finn Gartell
Samantha Elizabeth Blevins
ARIZONA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
345 East Palm Lane
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Attorneys for Intervenor Plaintiffs
Arizona Education Association, et al.

1 Jason Walta
2 NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
3 OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
4 1201 16th Street NW, Ste. 820
Washington, DC 20036-3290
5 Attorneys for Intervenor Plaintiffs
Arizona Education Association, et al.

6 Roopali H. Desai
7 COPPERSMITH SCHERMER & BROCKELMAN PLC
2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1200
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
8 Attorneys for Intervenor Plaintiffs
Arizona Education Association, et al.

9 Jessica R. Robinson
10 AFSCME
11 1101 17th St. NW, Ste. 900
Washington, DC 20036
12 Attorneys for Intervenor Plaintiffs
Local 449 American Federation
of State, County and Municipal
Employees, et al.

13 Michael L. Artz
14 AFL-CIO
15 1101 17th St. NW, Ste. 900
Washington, DC 20036
16 Attorneys for Intervenor Plaintiffs
Local 449 American Federation
of State, County and Municipal
Employees, et al.

17 David J. Strom
18 AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS
555 New Jersey Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20001
19 Attorneys for Intervenor Plaintiff
Arizona Federation of Teachers Union

20
21 /s/ Lea Wink

22 S:\COUNSEL\Civil\Matters\GN\2011\UFCW Local v. Jan Brewer GN11-0121\Pleadings\DefArpaio'sReply-MTD Intervenors 9-15-11.docx

23
24
25
26
27
28